



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/757,793

01/15/2004

Jordi Alborno

ROC920030291US1

5432

46797

7590

07/10/2008

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

PHAM, MICHAEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/757,793	Applicant(s) ALBORNOZ ET AL.	
	Examiner MICHAEL D. PHAM	Art Unit 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-13 and 25-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-13 and 25-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Status of claims

1. Claims 9-13 and 25-31 are pending.
2. Claims 9-13 and 25-31 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. New claims 30 and 31 recites “a marker” and “the marker” and is not disclosed in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary

skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 9-13 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7051275 by Gupta et. al. (hereafter Gupta) further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 20040261016 by Glass et. al. (hereafter Glass) and U.S. Patent Application Publication 20040252888 by Barger et. al. (hereafter Barger).

Claim 9:

Gupta discloses the following claimed limitations:

“annotations made for a current version of a document should be applied to a subsequent version of the document” [abstract, discloses each such annotations corresponding to each of the different versions of the multimedia document] and “annotations are applied to subsequent versions of the document.” [abstract, discloses each such annotations corresponding to each of the different versions of the multimedia document].

Gupta does not explicitly disclose “selecting one or more annotation versioning policies dictating how annotations made” should be applied; and “allowing creators of annotations for a current version of a document to select one or more of the annotations versioning policies.”

On the other hand, Glass discloses the following claimed limitations:

“selecting one or more annotation versioning policies dictating how annotations made” should be applied [0176, line 6, referring to a document annotation policy. Accordingly, selecting one or more (referring to) annotation versioning policies dictating how annotations should be applied (document annotation policy) is disclosed.]

“Allowing creators of annotations for a current version of a document to select one or more of the annotation versioning policies to dictate how annotations made”[0063, a system administrator or service provider configures and stores at least one document annotation definition at the server computer. A document annotation definition, once configured and stored, provides a structure for the method by which documents are annotated. Accordingly, allowing creators of annotations (administrator or service provider) for a current version of a document to select one or more annotation versioning policies (configures and stores at least one document annotation definition) to dictate how annotations made are applied (provides structure for the method by which documents are annotated) is disclosed.]

Both Gupta and Glass are directed to an annotation system, and are therefore well within applicant's field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art to have applied the disclosure of annotation policies by Glass above for the purpose of saving time and effort for an annotation system. In doing so increases document management functions for not only multiple documents but for different versions of documents as well.

Gupta and Glass do not explicitly disclose “wherein the subsequent version of the document includes one or more revisions to substantive content of the current version of the document”

On the other hand, Barger on discloses 0013, preserving the intent and meaning of digital ink annotations in an original document whenever the original document takes on a new layout

as a result of being edited or displayed on a different display device or in a different window size.

Accordingly, wherein the subsequent version of the document (original document takes on new layout) includes one or more revisions to substantive content (edited) of the current version of the document (original version).

Gupta, Glass, and Barger on all disclose systems of annotation, are analogous, and are within the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Barger on's disclosure above to the combination of Gupta and Glass for the purpose of preserving the intent and meaning of annotations made when new versions of documents are made.

Claim 10:

The combination of Gupta, Glass, and Barger on disclose in Barger on "wherein at least one of the annotation versioning policies dictates that annotations made for a current version will not be applied to subsequent versions of the document." [0014, The reflow module insures preservation of the user's original intent and meaning whenever the digital document is modified. The clean up module is an optional component that can be used to eliminate the user's original freehand annotations and redraw formalized cleaned-up versions of the annotations.]

Claim 11:

Art Unit: 2167

The combination of Gupta, Glass, and Barger on disclose in Gupta “the method of claim 9, wherein the one or more annotation versioning policies selected are applied at the document level, to all annotations created for a document.” [Col. 13 lines 34-36, allowing the creator of the set to identify which users are able to read and/or write to the annotation set].

Claim 12:

The combination of Gupta, Glass, and Barger on disclose in Gupta “the method of claim 9, wherein at least one of the annotation versioning policies dictates that an annotation created for a current version of a document will be applied to subsequent versions of the document.” [Col. 13 lines 34-36, allowing the creator of the set to identify which users are able to read and/or write to the annotation set].

Claim 13:

The combination of Gupta, Glass, and Barger on disclose in Gupta “the method of claim 9, wherein at least one of the annotation versioning policies dictates that an authorized user must validate an annotation created for a current version of a document before the annotation is applied to subsequent versions of the document.” [Col. 13 lines 21-24, this presentation allows, for example, the user to verify the portion of the media stream to which his or her annotation will correspond.]

Claim 25:

Gupta discloses the following claimed limitations:

“annotation created for a current version of a document are applied to one or more subsequent versions of the document” [Gupta abstract, annotations corresponding to different versions of the multimedia document]

“and providing an interface allowing a user to select one or more of the available annotation policies to be applied to the annotation”[Col. 13 lines 25-30, Annotation set identifier 272 allows the user to identify a named set to which the new annotation will belong. This set can be a previously defined set, or a new set being created by the user. Selection of the particular set can be made from a drop-down menu activated by selection of a button 273, or alternatively can be directly input by the user]

Gupta does not explicitly disclose “defining a set of available annotation policies, each dictating how annotations” are applied.

On the other hand, Glass discloses the following claimed limitations:
“defining a set of available annotation policies, each dictating how annotations” are applied [0166, line 6, referring to a document annotation policy. Accordingly, defining a set of (referring to) available annotation policies, each dictating how annotations should be applied (document annotation policy) is disclosed.]

Both Gupta and Glass are directed to an annotation system, and are therefore well within applicant's field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art to have applied the disclosure of annotation policies by Glass above for the purpose of saving

time and effort for an annotation system. In doing so increases document management functions for not only multiple documents but for different versions of documents as well.

Gupta and Glass do not explicitly disclose “wherein each subsequent version of the document includes one or more revisions to substantive content of the current version of the document”

On the other hand, Barger on discloses 0013, preserving the intent and meaning of digital ink annotations in an original document whenever the original document takes on a new layout as a result of being edited or displayed on a different display device or in a different window size.

Accordingly, wherein the subsequent version of the document (original document takes on new layout) includes one or more revisions to substantive content (edited) of the current version of the document (original version).

Gupta, Glass, and Barger on all disclose systems of annotation, are analogous, and are within the same field of endeavor as applicant’s invention. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Barger on’s disclosure above to the combination of Gupta and Glass for the purpose of preserving the intent and meaning of annotations made when new versions of documents are made.

Claim 26:

The combination of Gupta, Glass, and Barger on disclose in Gupta “the method of claim 25, wherein defining a set of available annotation policies comprises associating one or more annotation policies for use with annotations made for a certain type of document.” [Col. 9 lines 56-58, annotations could be associated with (or "anchored" on) specific objects in the video content, or specific events in the audio content.]

Claim 27:

The combination of Gupta, Glass, and Barger on disclose in Gupta “the method of claim 25, wherein the annotation policies provided to the user in the interface is determined, at least in part, on a credential of the user.” [Col. 13 lines 34-36, allowing the creator of the set to identify which users are able to read and/or write to the annotation set].

Claim 28:

The combination of Gupta, Glass, and Barger on disclose in Gupta discloses “the method of claim 27, wherein the annotation policies provided to the user in the interface is determined, at least in part, on a type of document associated with the annotation.” [Col. 12 lines 15-16, Annotation toolbar 240 includes various identifying information and user-selectable options 242 254.].

Claim 29:

The combination of Gupta, Glass, and Barger on disclose in Gupta discloses “the method of claim 25, wherein defining a set of available annotation policies comprises defining the set of available annotation policies by an administrator, wherein the administrator and the user are different entities.” [Col. 13 lines 34-36, allowing the creator of the set to identify which users are able to read and/or write to the annotation set].

Claim 30:

The combination of Gupta, Glass, and Barger on disclose in Barger on “wherein at least one of the annotation versioning policies dictates that an annotation created for a current version of a document and applied to a subsequent version of the document includes a marker indicating that the annotation in the subsequent version of the document is invalidated.” [0061, allows the user to interact and override the automatic functionality of modules]

Claim 31:

The combination of Gupta, Glass, and Barger on disclose in Barger on “The method of claim 30, wherein the marker is included in the annotation in the subsequent version of the document until an authorized user validates the annotation created for the current version of the document.”
[0061, allows the user to interact and override the automatic functionality of modules]

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9-13 and 25-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record listed on PTO-892 and not relied, if any, upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D. Pham whose telephone number is (571)272-3924. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/M. D. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2167

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2167